

To Advertisers.—Business men will find it greatly to their advantage to advertise in the Era.
Messrs. Penning & Co., S. B. Niles, and Joy, Coe, & Co., are our authorized advertising agents for Boston, New York, and Philadelphia.

The following gentlemen are accredited agents for the Era: G. W. Light, Boston, Mass.; J. A. Innis, Salem Mass.; Thomas Wheeler, Cincinnati, Ohio; L. T. Park, Mount Union, Ohio.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1859.

THE TWO YEARS' AMENDMENT.—We are gratified to perceive that the Republican press generally, outside of Massachusetts, regret the adoption of the two years' amendment. Indeed, most of the Republican newspapers in that State, it is said, deplore the result.

DEMOCRATIC STANDARD-BEARERS.

The official organ of Mr. Buchanan pays a high tribute to "the Democratic standard-bearers," but omits to designate a single individual to whom it is applicable. It seems to be a general puff of all who choose to regard themselves as "Democratic standard-bearers," but is too vague to be very flattering except to very vain and self-appropriating men. We confess that we are utterly at a loss to understand what class of "standard-bearers" the Constitution refers. It cannot be that the official organ is so catholic in spirit as to include Mr. Douglas in its category of patriot heroes; yet Mr. Douglas is the especial favorite of the Northern Democracy. Take away the Northern sympathizers with Mr. Douglas and his "popular sovereignty" dogmas, and there will not be left a corporal's guard of the party. It cannot intend to include Gov. Wise, who denounces the administration of Mr. Buchanan as corrupt in practice and federal in principle. It cannot mean the "Democratic" candidate for Governor in Kentucky, who maintains the "popular sovereignty" heresy of Mr. Douglas.

Who, then, can the Constitution refer to? To the slave traders of the Gulf States, or to the opponents of that traffic? To the friends of, or to the friends of intervention? To the friends of the Territories, or to the friends of non-intervention by Congress and the State Legislatures, or to the believers in unfriendly legislation? If the official organ dares all these except those who support the Administration to which it owes its existence, its compliments are more definite than might be inferred from the general terms used; and if it includes all who claim to be "Democrats," the greater part of its utility will fall to the share of the bitter opponents of the President.

MESSRS. DOUGLAS AND FORNEY.

The Philadelphia Press, edited by Col. Forney, speaks complacently of the fact that the Washington States is called the organ of Mr. Douglas. In that paper of a recent date we find the following notice to excuse Mr. Douglas from intervention:

The Douglass.—The Washington States, which is called by the Administration papers, for their own purposes, the organ of Judge Douglas, and which has taken some pains to do injustice to the States Rights Democracy of Pennsylvania, defines its position as follows: "We have repudiated the doctrine of popular sovereignty. We have denied authority to the Territorial Governments to abolish or in any way impair the security of slave property. On the contrary, we have maintained it to be the duty of the local Legislatures to supply every requisite for its protection. The non-intervention for which we contend is simply the abstention of Congress from any action in respect to Slavery in the Territories. The policy we support, in substance, is the maintenance of the status quo, and the avoidance of the injurious effects of the Cincinnati platform. We differ with Judge Douglas in his conception of Territorial power, and we have been at no pains to conceal our dissent. We agree with him only in the policy of Congressional non-intervention."

The Press thinks this definition of its position by the States conclusive that it cannot be the organ of Mr. Douglas. But the difference is very trifling, and it is just what ought to be expected from a Southern supporter of the Illinois Senator. It would be impracticable to maintain, in a Southern "Democratic" newspaper, that the people of a Territory, to use its own language, had the right to abolish or to postpone the institution of Slavery. Yet, in the face of this decision, the Senator from Illinois thinks it constitutes that the people of a Territory, to use its own language, had the right to abolish or to postpone the institution of Slavery in a certain way, if they think proper, by "unfriendly legislation."

A grosser inconsistency cannot be imagined. His position compels him, as the Representative of a free State, and ambitious of future honor at the hands of the people, to hold on to a theory of "popular sovereignty" which had some vitality when it was formed; but his solicitude to preserve the good opinion of the South has at the same time constrained him to admit the validity of a Supreme Court decision which utterly extinguishes his theory of popular rights. The result is, that on Mr. Douglas's theory one party or the other must be cheated.

His platform is a cheat and a snare to the North and to the South; and supposing him invested with Executive power, he would be compelled either to extinguish "popular sovereignty" by a rigid enforcement of the Dred Scott principle, or reheat the South by encouraging or frustrating its infraction by the popular sovereign.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION.

The American Medical Association held its annual meeting this year at Louisville, Kentucky, on the first Tuesday of May. There were more than three hundred delegates present, from nearly every State in the Union, and the meeting seems to have been in every respect harmonious and successful. The annual address was delivered by the retiring President, Dr. Lindley, of Washington, of which the Louisville paper speaks in highly flattering terms.

One paper says:—"The address of the President was listened to with marked attention. It was an able, eloquent, and graceful tribute to the merits of the profession, with an instructive and interesting account of professional improvement and discoveries of the last fifty years."

It was referred to the Committee on Publication, to be printed.

The delegates were entertained by the medical profession and the citizens of Louisville with unbounded hospitality during the whole period of their visit, the festivities being closed by a grand ball, which was graced by the presence of many distinguished persons.

After a session of three days, the Convention adjourned, to meet in New Haven, June, 1860.

The Springfield Republican thus notices the success of the two annual meetings held in Massachusetts:—"It is a victory of mine to win policy, a narrow conceit, and religious and national bigotry, and will return to plague the politicians who assisted in winning it."

POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY.

The Washington Constitution of the 13th inst. has an article upon the Dred Scott decision, which is intended especially for Mr. Douglas, and which effectually exposes the false and untenable position he occupies in regard to the doctrine of popular sovereignty. That doctrine, as General Cass laid it down in his Nicholson letter, and as it was preached and proclaimed from Liverpool of the 4th instant, and the Nova Scotia at Quebec with the same dates. By these arrivals we gather the above conclusive evidence of the commencement of war. Napoleon III, in his war manifesto, addressed to the Corps Legislatif, says:

"Her national allies have always been those that desire the amelioration of the human race, and when she draws the sword, it is *not to exterminate*."

"The war then of this war, is restore Italy to herself, not to impose upon her a change of masters; and we shall then have upon our frontiers a friendly people, who will owe to us their independence."

"We do not enter Italy to foment disorder, or disturb the peace of Italy Father, wherefrom him this foreign pressure, which burdens the whole peninsula. To help to establish order there, based upon lawful and satisfied interests."

"We enter this classic ground, rendered illustrious by so many victories, to seek the footstep of our fathers. God grant we may be worthy of them!"

THE AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY.

The American Tract Society met in New York, Wednesday, May 11. Its proceedings, as detailed in the New York daily journals, resemble the duiker meetings of a Tammany meeting, rather than the deliberations of a religious association. The Society by its action prostrated itself before the slave power with circumstances of moral degradation far eclipsing anything in its previous career. Hitherto it has refused to publish tracta condemning Slavery and its abuses, but at its late meeting it went a step lower by repeatedly voting down resolutions condemnatory of the effort now making to revive the African slave trade.

After repeated efforts, in which he was stoned and hissed into silence, the Rev. Dr. Paton was permitted to read the following resolution:

"Whereas the African slave trade is contrary to the principles of the Gospel and Christianity, is condemned by all Christian civilization, and is repudiated by all Christians civilized, and enlightened nations; and whereas there are indications that this trade, with all its crimes and horrors, already, or is about to be, reopened by adventurers from this country; and whereas the only barrier to this trade is the name, ennobled by the Gospel; therefore,

"Resolved, That the Publishing Committee directed to issue during the present year a tract or tractlet calculated to arouse and concentrate the religious sentiment of all Christian men against the slave trade, and set forth its great wickedness so that it may meet the eyes of the world."

The resolution was voted down by an immense majority.

Senator Douglas admits the authority of this decision. Departing entirely from the old Republican Rights theory of Jefferson, John Taylor of Caroline, Nathaniel Macon, and William B. Giles, the Senator from Illinois adopts the position of the Federalists, who the Supreme Judiciary is the final arbiter of constitutional questions.

With such an admission, he cannot maintain the right of the people to exclude Slavery from Territories in any legitimate way; and his suggestion that Slavery may be kept out by unfriendly legislation, in the face of a constitutional guarantee, may well be charged by the friends of the institution as tending to invite to rebellion against the constituted authorities.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

The Republican States which have passed laws repudiating the fugitive slave act, have done so on the high States Rights ground that the act is unconstitutional. They have given an example of "unfriendly legislation" for the nullification or evasion of a Congressional enactment, but they have done so conscientiously, and in good faith, as the friends of the Constitution.

